



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/477,021	01/03/2000	ANIL KUMAR CHANDRUPATLA	CISCO-1340	8615

7590 11/21/2002

DAVID B RITCHIE
D'ALESSANDRO & RITCHIE
P O BOX 640640
SAN JOSE, CA 95164-0640

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/477,021

Applicant(s)

CHANDRUPATLA ET AL.

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3, 6-8</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-42 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 25, 27-29, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chuah et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,400,722.

Art Unit: 2142

4. As to claim 1, Chuah discloses a method for centrally managing a computer network, including of:

maintaining a central database of all NASes (Network Access Servers) known to the computer network (col. 1, lines 29-54 and col. 9, lines 10-48: plural inter-working function modules (IWFs) which are considered as network access servers (NASes) in the network; and col. 33, lines 45-53, col. 39, lines 28-54: NASes are connected to a data center); and

broadcasting a message to a NAS list located at each POP (Point Of Presence) in the computer network whenever said central database is changed, said message containing information regarding the change (col. 1, lines 29-54 and col. 42, line 52 – col. 44, line 37).

5. As to claim 2, Chuah discloses wherein all of the NASes known to the computer network are all NASes within the computer network which have been chosen as being valid (col. 20, line 24 – col. 21, line 13: a password authentication protocol (PAP authentication request is sent to the home NASes for validating).

6. As to claim 6, Chuah discloses wherein said broadcasting is performed automatically by a broker whenever a change to said central database is made (col. 19, line 42 – col. 20, line 5).

7. As to claim 7, Chuah discloses wherein said broadcasting includes publishing a broker event via a broker (col. 19, line 42 – col. 20, line 5).

8. Claims 25, 27-29, and 40 are corresponding apparatus and program storage device claims containing similar limitations as discussed in the method of claims 1-2, and 6-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 3-5, 18-24, 26, 38-39, 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chuah et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,400,722 and further in view of Holt et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,070,192.

11. As to claim 3, Chuah discloses all the limitation as discussed above. However, Chuah et al. do not disclose said maintaining is performed by a Network Control Console. In the same field of endeavor, Holt et al. disclose a network controller

comprises means for maintaining a record of tunnels currently connected between NASes and network gateways (col. 4, line 27 – col. 5, line 64). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chuah et al. and Holt et al. to include a network controller for maintaining a record of tunnels connected between NASes and network gateways because Holt et al. suggest that using network controller for deriving operational data from at least one of connection setup requests, connection setup responses, connection release requests, connection release acknowledgements and error conditions detected by the network controller.

12. As to claim 4, Chuah and Holt (Chuah-Holt) disclose said Network Control Console is a graphical interface (Holt, col. 9, lines 50-61 and Fig. 2).

13. As to claim 5, Chuah-Holt disclose said maintaining includes adding NASes, deleting NASes, and modifying the entries of NASes in the central database as the need arises (Holt, col. 5, lines 47-64 and col. 10, lines 36-46, Chuah, col. 10, line 49 – col. 11, line 3).

14. As to claim 18, Chuah discloses a method for handling an access request at a PoP, said access request generated by a user logging on to said PoP, said user having a home PoP, the method including:

determining if said user's home PoP is said PoP (col. 1, lines 29-54 and col. 19, lines 5-28: the registration server uses User-Name from the user registration agent (user's home PoP) to determine the end system's home network) ;

forwarding said access request to an registration server located at said PoP if said user's home PoP is said PoP (col. 1, lines 29-54 and col. 19, lines 5-28: forwarding the registration request for authentication to a registration server (AAA server) in the home network); and

relaying said access request to said user's home PoP if said user's home PoP is not said PoP (col. 10, line 12 – col. 11, line 3 and col. 17, lines 14-43).

However, Chuah does not disclose registration server is an AAA server. In the same field of endeavor, Holt discloses end-user AAA (authentication, authorization, and accounting) can be performed by a local exchange carrier on behalf of the DSP. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Chuah and Holt to include an AAA server because the AAA server authorizes each user to have access to the network and performs various accounting functions to maintain a record of users who have logged onto the network as well as other functions such as loading specific network profile information.

15. As to claim 19, Chuah-Holt disclose wherein said determining, forwarding, and relaying are performed by a Protocol Gateway (Holt, col. 9, lines 15-49)

16. As to claim 20, Chuah-Holt disclose wherein said determining includes examining a user name entered by said user (Chuah, col. 19, lines 5-28).

17. As to claim 21, Chuah-Holt disclose wherein said determining further includes parsing said user name to reveal a PoP location indicated within said user name (Chuah, col. 34, lines 18-28).

18. As to claim 22, Chuah-Holt disclose wherein said PoP location indicated within said user name is a city name as a prefix to said user name (Chuah, col. 26, lines 7-48 and col. 34, lines 18-28).

19. As to claim 23, Chuah-Holt disclose wherein said PoP location indicated within said user name is an abbreviation for a city name contained within a domain name affixed to the end of said user name (Chuah, col. 26, lines 7-48 and col. 34, lines 18-28).

20. As to claim 24, Chuah-Holt disclose wherein said determining further includes parsing said user names to reveal a domain name, said domain name indicating an ISP in control of said home PoP (Chuah, col. 26, lines 7-48 and col. 34, lines 18-28).

21. Claims 26, 38-39, and 41-42 are corresponding apparatus and program storage device containing similar limitations as discussed in the method of claims 3-5 and 18-24; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

22. Claims 8-17, and 30-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holt et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,070,192 and further in view of Chuah et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,400,722.

23. As to claim 8, Holt discloses a method for locally processing an access request at a in a computer network, said access request received from a NAS, the method including:

accessing a list of network access servers (NASes) and the computer network (col. 10, lines 36-46); and

validating that said access request was received from a known entity by determining if an entry exists in said list for the NAS from which the access request was received (col. 10, lines 36-46).

However, Holt does not disclose said list of NASes known to the PoP and located locally at the PoP. In the same field of endeavor, Chuah discloses internet service provider (ISP) deploys and manages one or more points of presence (PoPs) in its service are to which end users connect for network service (col. 1, lines 29-54 and col. 9, lines 10-48). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Holt an Chuah to include one

or more points of presence (POPs) in service of ISP because Chuah suggests that by providing more points of presence, end users access the ISP by dialing the nearest POP and running a communication protocol known as point-to-point protocol (PPP).

24. As to claim 9, Holt and Chuah (Holt-Chuah) disclose retrieving a user record from a database of user records located locally at said PoP, said database of user records containing records for those users who have been identified as having the PoP as their home PoP (Chuah, col. 10, line 33-45 and col. 11, lines 21-42).

25. As to claim 10, Holt-Chuah disclose each entry in said list contains a field identifying a NAS and a field identifying a dictionary of attributes supported by the corresponding NAS (Holt, col. 9, lines 15-49 and col. 12, line 64 –col. 13, line 7)..

26. As to claims 11 and 15, Holt-Chuah disclose wherein said dictionary of attributes is a RADIUS (Holt, col. 9, lines 15-49; Chuah, col. 27, lines 25-53).

27. As to claim 12, Holt-Chuah disclose wherein said each entry in said list contains fields for:

a domain name of a NAS (Chuah, col. 27, lines 25-53: NAS-IP-Address);
a vendor name of the NAS (Chuah, col. 27, lines 25-53: AP-IP-Address, or AP-MAC-Address);

a shared secret between all known NASes and AAA servers in the network (Chuah, col. 25, lines 46-49 and col. 27, lines 25-53: user password attribute); and a dictionary name, said dictionary name indicating a dictionary of attributes supported by said NAS (Chuah, col. 27, lines 25-53: Xtunnel Protocol Parameters).

28. As to claim 13, Holt-Chuah disclose wherein said validating further includes validating that said access request was received from a known entity by determining if the domain name that the access request was received from matches the domain name field of any entry in said list (Chuah, col. 35, line 36 – col. 36, line 67).

29. As to claim 14, Holt-Chuah disclose wherein said validating further including examining whether a password supplied with said access request matches the shared secret field of a corresponding entry in said list if the domain name that the access request was received from matches the domain name field of any entry in said list (Chuah, col. 33, lines 16-26).

30. As to claim 16, Holt-Chuah disclose wherein said accessing and validating are performed by an Authentication, Authorization, and Accounting (AAA) server (Holt, col. 7, line 60 – col. 8, line 37).

31. As to claim 17, Holt-Chuah disclose subscribing to a broker event to update said list whenever NAS known to the computer network is added, deleted, or modified (Holt, col. 5, lines 47-64 and col. 10, lines 36-46, Chuah, col. 10, line 49 – col. 11, line 3).

32. Claims 30-37 are corresponding apparatus claims containing similar limitations as discussed in the method of claims 8-17; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4639. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart, can be reached at (703) 305-4815.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 (After Final Communications only)

(703) 746-7239 (Official Communications)

(703) 746-7240(for Official Status Inquiries, Draft Communications only)

Inquiries of a general nature relating to the general status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2152



MARK H. RINEHART
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100